



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/674,714	12/19/2000	Bjarke De Jaeger Gotfredsen	Scard-card reader	3520

7590 01/16/2003

DANIEL P. MAGUIRE
ATTORNEY AT LAW
423 E STREET
DAVIS, CA 95616

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

FRANKLIN, JAMARA ALZAIDA

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 01/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/674,714	GOTFREDSEN, BJARKE DE JAEGER	
	Examiner Jamara A. Franklin	Art Unit 2876	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2002.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgment is made of the receipt of the response filed on 11/6/02. Claims 1-32 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 13, 15, 18, 20, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson (US. Des. 380,462).

Wilson teaches an integrated notebook computer, retractable mouse pad, and disk drive as illustrated in fig. 1.

Wilson does not explicitly show the read/write device integrated with the mouse pad.

As broadly interpreted, when the mouse pad is not retracted and sitting within the body of the notebook computer, the disk drive and mouse pad are integrated since the two components lie within the same housing. Furthermore, it is noted that the integration of a mouse pad unit and read/write device is viewed as an obvious engineering design choice and holds no patentable weight since no new and unexpected result is generated by the combination of the mouse pad and read/write device.

Art Unit: 2876

3. Claims 1-12, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson in view of Okaya et al (US 5,625,534) (hereinafter referred to as ‘Okaya’).

The teachings of Wilson have been discussed above.

Wilson lacks the teaching of a card read/write device integrated with the mouse pad unit.

Okaya teaches a notebook computer having means for processing data on magnetic stripe cards or smart cards (col. 6, line 61-col. 7, line 16).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that providing the mouse pad unit of Wilson with the various forms of data storage would have been beneficial for allowing a variety of different forms of data to be stored and retrieved. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Wilson with the data card processing device as taught by Okaya.

4. Claims 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson in view of Panasik et al. (US 5,987,547) (hereinafter referred to as ‘Panasik’).

The teachings of Wilson have been discussed above.

Wilson lacks the teaching of a CD-ROM, DVD, or removable hard drive integrated with the mouse pad unit.

Panasik teaches a portable computer 18 with means for processing data on a removable hard drive, a CD-ROM, or DVD (col. 3, lines 33-38).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that providing the mouse pad unit of Wilson with the various forms of data storage read/write devices would have been

Art Unit: 2876

beneficial for allowing a variety of different forms of data to be stored and retrieved. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Wilson with the data processing device as taught by Panasik.

5. Claims 25-30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson/Okaya in view of House (US 4,799,054).

The teachings of Wilson/Okaya have been discussed above.

Wilson/Okaya lack the teaching of text placed on the exterior surface of the mouse pad.

House teaches a mouse pad having advertisement incorporated onto a mouse pad (col. 7, lines 42-47).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that the inclusion of visual information onto the mouse pad would have been advantageous since it would have immediately made the user aware of a product or to any particular pertinent data whenever the user looked in the direction of his hand. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Wilson/Okaya with the placement of the advertisement as taught by House.

Response to Amendment

6. The declaration filed on 11/6/02 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome the Lester and Braun references of the office action of paper no. 14.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Holtzman et al. (US 6,400,272) teach a wireless transceiver for communicating with tags wherein a mouse pad is used as a tag reader.

McAuliffe et al. (US 6,056,193) teach a computer keyboard with integral encoded device reader.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jamara A. Franklin whose telephone number is 703-305-0128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G Lee can be reached on 730-308-4909. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703)308-7722 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2876

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.


Jamara A. Franklin
Examiner
Art Unit 2876

JAF
January 13, 2003


Diane I. Lee
Primary Examiner